

REMARKS

Examiner's Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner for the telephone interview granted to their Attorney on May 9, 2005. In this interview, Applicants' attorney sought to define claims patentable over the Examiner's references. Applicants had sent a proposed amended claim to Examiner prior to Interview pursuant to Examiner request for more details. The proposed claim is the basis for the present amendment. In the Interview, Applicants pointed out that the Grundy paper is a very limited reference. It has little to do with shared group development of plurality of objects. The present invention covers an implementation in which development or building is shared or participated in by groups of users with each user enabled to access a plurality of sequences of build events, each sequence of build events creating a different object. Each participating user in the group can interactively access the individual events in each of a plurality of sets of events to undertake, with respect to the others, to either to register or unregister to perform specific actions in the development of events. The Grundy paper is totally lacking of any teaching of enabling any of a group of users to register or unregister to perform specific acts. In Grundy, while user may be able to display a variety of processes, the user can not interactively register or unregister to perform certain acts. The claims proposed by Applicant at Interview would emphasize the group i.e. plurality of users aspect of the invention.

Applicants' Argument:

Applicants submit that the amended claims cover patentable subject matter. Therefore claims 1, 6-8, 12, 17-19, 23, and 27-30 as amended are submitted to be: patentable over the Grundy publication under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). At most Grundy may share some common objectives with the process of the present invention i.e. informing other users involved in a production project what certain users are doing in the project. The present invention offers a specific implementation to a shared work project which is not suggested by Grundy.

The present invention covers a shared work project in which several sets of software objects are being built through several respective sequences of build events which are to be contributed to by the users through the respective users selectively interactively registering to perform specific actions in the respective build event or conversely to interactively unregister from performing such acts. Since all of the sequential build events are displayed, and thus visible to all users, and the users are free to interactively register and unregister for specific actions on selected build events in selected sequences forming program objects. In this manner, any of the plurality of users who will be affected by the actions of other users in registering or unregistering, can observe such actions and then take appropriate action in response.

The users in Grundy's may be able to selectively display what other workers have done in work processes but there is no provision wherein a user may interactively with respect to a display screen selectively register to do specific actions to any one event in one of a set of

sequences in the building program objects or unregister with respect to a specific action.

The Examiner does concede that Grundy does not disclose the concept of registering or unregistering for specific action relative to events but Examiner argues that such action registration or unregistration would be obvious. Applicants submit that in view of the foregoing, the event action registration or unregistration is unobvious from the teaching of Grundy.

Building further on this concept of registration and unregistration for the performance of selected actions, claims 8, 19 and 30 cover a specific implementation wherein one of the registered users is the manager of the building of one of the sets of events to produce one of the objects. There is nothing in the general teaching of Grundy suggestive of this specific implementation. The disclosure in Grundy, which the Examiner cites for this aspect of the invention, generally discloses that on a displayed process, proposed modifications would have to be approved by a project manager. This is not specific enough to suggest the specific management of registration and unregistration defined in claim 8, 19, and 30.

The rejection of remaining claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 31-33 under 35 USC 103(a) based on the combination of Grundy in view of Notess is also respectfully traversed. These claims are of course submitted to be patentable over the basic Grundy reference for the reasons set forth above. In addition, these claims have further limitations specific to the implementation of the present invention. Since the Examiner has selected to reject representative claims from each of several groups, this argument will address the representative claim in each group.

Dependent representative claims 2 and 3 have the limitation that the users from the participating group be authorized to perform the actions for which they register. The general teaching of a manager controlled object building system in Notess does generally disclose an authorization implementation but not in any way related to any registration/unregistration of action implementation like that of the present invention.

Dependent claim 4 covers the automatic performance of a registered action in response to a triggering event state. Notess does generally disclose that actions may be triggered by event states but nothing related to any registration/unregistration of action implementation like that of the present invention.

The same argument is applicable to the rejection of claim 5 wherein the user may have the option of selectively having a registered action performed in response to a triggering build event. All Notess recognizes is the conventional user over-ride of a default condition in any product build procedure. This is not related to a registered action in an event having a select option under defined circumstances.

Representative claim 9 has limitations specific to the registration/unregistration implementation of the present inventions, and is, thus, patentable for the reasons set forth hereinabove for independent claim 1. The claim has a further limitation regarding the determination of whether a user is authorized to register to perform specific actions. While Notess may disclose in general the determination of user authorization for specified actions, it is clearly not in any environment like the registration/unregistration environment of the present invention.

PATENT
09/966,005

Claim 10 is an independent claim defining the same registration/unregistration of event building actions environment of the present invention as described above with respect to the other independent claims but has the further limitations that the actions selectable to be registered are set forth in a menu associated with each build event in a sequence of build events. In this way, the user may select an action for which to register from the menu. All Examiner cites in Notess is a disclosure of a menu of actions which may be used in association with a process step but not with any registration for an action.

Neither the basic Grundy reference, the modifying Notess patent, nor the combination thereof disclose the gist of the present invention wherein a group of authorized users i.e. builders of sequences of events in the formation of program objects have interactive display access to a plurality of sets of sequential build events in the building of a plurality of related program objects. Within this display environment of displayed concurrent related program builds, a user may select to register or unregister interactively for the performance of actions with respect to selected build events, and this registration of actions is viewable by the other users who may be affected by the selection of such actions.

PATENT
09/966,005

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-33 as amended are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Kraft 5/11/05
J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Jeffrey S. LaBaw
IPLaw Dept.-MAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758